

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed September 7, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 21-42. By way of the foregoing, Applicants have amended claims 21, 27, 31 and 39 and have added dependent claims 43 and 44. The foregoing amendments are taken in the interest of expediting prosecution and there is no intention of surrendering any range of equivalents to which Applicant would otherwise be entitled in view of the prior art. More particularly, Applicants believe that the present amendments to the claims have been made to address formalities and should not affect the scope of the claims or the scope of equivalents of the claims.

I. Claim Objections

The Office Action objected to claim 21, line 19 suggesting that the “recitation ‘the seond [sic] surface of the first seond [sic] members’; ... would appear to be more precisely written as –the second surface of each of the first and the second members --.” Applicants have made a change similar to the one suggested by the Office Action and believe that the change properly addresses the issue raised by the Office Action. If the Examiner feels that the issue is not properly addressed, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned such that desirable language can be entered into the claim.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 USC 112

The Office Action rejected claim 21-42 under 35 USC 112.

The Office Action suggests that the phrase “a first and second surface” at claim 21, line 15; claim 31, line 17 and claim 39, line 20 lacks clarity as to, “whether what is being claimed is a cavity defined by a surface called the ‘first and second surface’ or whether what is being claimed is a cavity defined by a first surface and a second surface or whether some other structure is being claimed.”

The Office Action also suggests that “the second surface” as recited in claim 26, line 1 lacks antecedent basis.

The Office Action also suggests that claim 27, lines 1-2 are unclear as to “whether there are two surfaces claimed by the recitation ‘the first and second surface’ or whether...it is one surface...”

Applicants have amended claims 21, 31 and 39 to address the issues raised by the Office Action. Applicants believe that the changes properly remedy the rejection posited by the Office Action. Applicants further believe that the amendment to claim 21 addresses the issue raised by the Office Action in regards to claim 26. Still further, Applicants have amended claim 27 to address the issue raised by the Office Action. If the Examiner feels that the issues are not properly addressed, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned such that desirable language can be entered into the claims.

For purposes of clarity, it should be understood that, while the first surface and the second surface defining the cavity are separate surfaces, it is contemplated that the first surface and the second surface defining the cavity can be separate portions of one larger surface or may be separate surfaces of a component or may be surfaces of separate components.

III. Claim Rejections – Double Patenting

The Office Action rejected claims 21-24, 31-34 and 36-42 for obviousness-type double patenting over claims of US Patent 6,729,425. Applicants submit herewith a terminal disclaimer to overcome these objections.

IV. New Claims

Applicants have added new claims 43 and 44 to address aspects of the invention of the present application.

By the present amendment, it does not follow that the amended claims have become so perfect in their description that no one could devise an equivalent. After amendment, as before, limitations in the ability to describe the present invention in language in the patent claims naturally prevent the Applicants from capturing every nuance of the invention or describing with complete precision the range of its novelty or every possible equivalent. See, Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., 62 USPQ2d 1705 (2002). Accordingly, the foregoing amendments are made specifically in the interest of expediting prosecution and there is no intention of surrendering any range of equivalents to which Applicants would otherwise be entitled.


CONCLUSIONS

In view of Applicants' amendments and remarks, the Examiner's rejections are believed to be rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and requests that the Examiner pass the case to issue at the earliest convenience. Should the Examiner have any question or wish to further discuss this application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (248) 292-2920.

If for some reason Applicant has not requested a sufficient extension and/or have not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for the extension necessary to prevent the abandonment of this application, please consider this as a request for an extension for the required time period and/or authorization to charge our Deposit Account No. 50-1097 for any fee which may be due.

Dated: 2 December, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Scott A. Chapple
Registration No. 46,287
DOBRUSIN & THENNISCH PC
29 W. Lawrence Street
Suite 210
Pontiac, MI 48342
(248) 292-2920

Customer No. 25215